

Patent
Docket No. PLX-001-1P US
2245447004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Box Non Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231**

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Dear Sir/Madam:

This response is filed in response to the Office Action mailed October 9, 2002.

REMARKS:

In the Office Action mailed October 9, 2002, claims 1-11, 17-24, 33-40, 49-51, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,321,205 (“the Eder reference”), and claims 25-27, 41-43, 52, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Eder reference in view of an article by Kossovsky et al. (“the Kossovsky et al. reference”). Because neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of the present claims, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Turning first to the Eder reference, a system and method are disclosed for evaluating the impact of changes in business value drivers on other value drivers, the financial performance, and the future value of a commercial enterprise. (Col. 1, lines 18-22). The disclosed system is intended to extract, aggregate, and store transaction data and user input required to complete a valuation. (Col. 8, lines 3-6). The Eder reference discloses several variables that are stored in the database, none of which includes a technology classification nor information about publicly traded securities. (Col. 2, lines 26-60).

The Eder reference briefly mentions that an external database may be used in the valuation (col. 12, lines 1-3), but merely discloses retrieving information from the internet to enable valuation